

## **REMARKS**

Applicant has studied the Office Action of July 1, 2004 and made amendments to the specification and claims, as indicated hereinabove, to place the application in condition for allowance.

Claims 8 and 16 have been canceled. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to define Applicant's invention over the cited prior art. No new subject matter has been added. Support for the amendments is provided in the drawings and the specification, particularly page 9.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 10-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 122 as being indefinite for failing to particularly recite the subject matter of the invention. Claim 10 is amended as suggested by the Examiner. It is therefore submitted that the rejection under section 112 is now moot and should be withdrawn.

### **Objection to Specification**

The Examiner objected to language at page 6, lines 15-16 and required correction in light of the suggested amendments to claim 10. The appropriate correction has been noted. Applicant respectfully requests the specification to be amended as suggested above in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Asano et al (U.S. Patent 5,909,083). Asano et al teach a process for producing a plasma display panel by forming a predetermined pattern forming material layer on a substrate; forming a mask pattern, etching the pattern-forming material, and then firing the pattern-forming material layer with the mask pattern provided thereon to integrate the pattern-forming material layer and the mask layer (See Abstract).

The Examiner asserts that Asano et al anticipate the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Applicant respectfully submits that a 102(b) reference must within the four corners of that document disclose each and every element which is set forth in the claim against which it is applied. Furthermore, every element of the claimed invention,

as recited in the claims, must be disclosed either specifically or inherently by a 102(b) reference. See *Minnesota Mining & Mfg. Co. v. Johnson & Johnson Orthopaedics, Inc.*, 976 F.2d 1559, 1565 (Fed.Cir.1992); *Scripps*, 927 F.2d at 1576-77; *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH, v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 1458 (Fed.Cir.1984).

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 10, as amended, are not anticipated by Asano et al. Particularly, Asano et al fail to teach, suggest, or disclose a photosensitive black resist layer formed on the white paste layer, wherein the photosensitive black resist layer comprises paraffin wax diffusible in the photorist black resist layer when heated. The Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and no portion of the reference suggests or implies a photosensitive black resist layer with a composition that includes paraffin wax, such that the paraffin wax is diffused in the photosensitive black resist layer by heating to provide resistance against sandblasting.

Since at least one of the above-recited elements is not taught by Asano et al, then the cited reference fails to anticipate claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 and claims 2-7 and 9 depending therefrom should be in condition for allowance.

Amended claim 10 also includes and incorporates all the elements of claim 1. Amended claim 10 further recites “plasticizing the photosensitive black resist pattern and the remaining white paste layer.” The Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and no portion of the reference suggests or implies plasticizing the photosensitive black resist pattern and the remaining white paste layer. As such, Asano et al also fail to anticipate claim 10 and claims 11-15 and 17-18 depending therefrom.

For the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance.

### **Conclusion**

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein, and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such

amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

Date: October 1, 2004

By: 

Lew Edward V. Macapagal

Registration No. 55,416

Attorney(s) for Applicant(s)

Customer No. 035884

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

801 S. Figueroa Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

Los Angeles, California 90017

Telephone: 213-623-2221

Facsimile: 213-623-2211